arXiv:1609.01266v1 [cs.DM] 5 Sep 2016

Integrality of minimal unit circular-arc models

Francisco J. Soulignac*† Pablo Terlisky†‡

francisco.soulignac@unq.edu.ar, terlisky@dc.uba.ar

Abstract

A *proper circular-arc (PCA) model* is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (C, \mathcal{A})$ where C is a circle and $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of inclusion-free arcs on C in which no two arcs of $\mathcal{A}$ cover C. A PCA model $\mathcal{U}$ is a (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-*CA* model when C has circumference c, all the arcs in $\mathcal{A}$ have length ℓ, all the extremes of the arcs in $\mathcal{A}$ are at a distance at least d, and all the beginning points of the arcs in $\mathcal{A}$ are at a distance at least $d + d_s$. If $c \leq c'$ and $\ell \leq \ell'$ for every (c', ℓ', d, d_s)-CA model, then $\mathcal{U}$ is (d, d_s)-*minimal*. In this article we prove that c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s when $\mathcal{U}$ is (d, d_s)-*minimal*. As a consequence, we obtain an algorithm to compute a (d, d_s)-minimal model equivalent to an input PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ that runs in $O(n^3)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space.

1 Introduction

The last decade saw an increasing research on numerical problems for unit interval and unit circular-arc models [2, 5, 14, 16, 17]. In these problems, we are given an unrestricted model and we have to find an equivalent numerical model that satisfies certain constraints. Before defining our problems, we briefly describe what we mean when we refer to numerical models.

A *proper circular-arc (PCA) model* is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (C, \mathcal{A})$ where C is a circle and $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite collection of inclusion-free open arcs of C in which no pair of arcs in $\mathcal{A}$ cover C. For points s, t of C, we write (s, t) to mean the arc of C defined by traversing the circle from s to t, and $|s, t|$ to mean the length of (s, t). Each arc $A = (s, t) \in \mathcal{A}$ is described by its *extremes*, $s(A) = s$ and $t(A) = t$. We assume C has a special point, called 0, such that $s(A) = |0, s(A)|$ and $t(A) = |0, t(A)|$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, respectively. The existence of 0 allows us to define an ordering $<$ on $\mathcal{A}$ such that $A_1 < A_2$ if and only if $s(A_1) < s(A_2)$. Also, we say that a PCA model $\mathcal{M}_1$ is *equivalent* to a PCA model $\mathcal{M}_2$ when the extremes of $\mathcal{M}_1$ appear in the same order as in $\mathcal{M}_2$ in the traversals of C_1 and C_2 from their respective 0 points. A *UCA descriptor* is a tuple $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$ such that $c, \ell, d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. A PCA model $\mathcal{M} = (C, \mathcal{A})$ is a u-*CA model* when:

- the circumference of C is c,
- $|s(A), t(A)| = \ell$ for every arc $A \in \mathcal{A}$,
- $|e_1, e_2| \geq d$, for every pair of extremes e_1, e_2, and
- $|s(A), s(A')| \geq d + d_s$, for ever pair of arcs $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$.

*CONICET

†Departamento de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, Bernal, Argentina.

‡Instituto de Cálculo, FCEN, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

In general, $\mathcal{M}$ is a *unit circular-arc (UCA)* model when all its arcs have the same length (thus $\mathcal{M}$ is a u-CA model for some UCA descriptor u). In this work, *proper interval (PIG)* and *unit interval (UIG)* models correspond to those PCA and UCA models in which no arc crosses 0.

The classical *(unrestricted) UIG-representation problem*, in which a UIG model $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to an input PIG model $\mathcal{M}$ is to be found, is one of the most studied representation problems on PIG models. In our framework, the UIG-representation problem asks for a $(c, \ell, 1, 0)$-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$. The UIG-representation problem is one of the motivations in the pioneering works by Goodman [12] and Luce [18], that date back to the 1940's and 1950's, respectively, and is important for any decision-making problem in which data comes from a source that is not able to accomplish a high enough level of discernibility. So, unsurprisingly, this problem arises in areas as diverse as economics, psychology, biology, archeology, among others (cf. [21, 24]). A foundational result by Scott and Suppes [23] and Fine and Harrop [7] (see also [22]) states that every PIG model is equivalent to a UIG model. Moreover, such a UIG model can be found either in linear time [1, 17, 19] or logspace [15].

Allowing the input $\mathcal{M}$ to be any general PCA model, we obtain a natural generalization of the UIG-representation problem. In this problem, called the *(unrestricted) UCA-representation problem*, we also have to find a $(c, \ell, 1, 0)$-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$. This generalization has applications of its own (e.g. [6, 10]) and, even though it was less studied than its UIG restriction, it was an important part of Goodman's [12] work. One major difference between the UIG- and the UCA-representation problems is that not all the PCA models have equivalent UCA models. The characterization of the family $\mathbb{M}$ of PCA models that have equivalent UCA models was given by Tucker [25]. Recently, several algorithms appeared to determine if $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}$ that run in either linear time [13, 16, 24] or logspace [24]. These algorithms output either a UCA model equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$ (when $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}$) or one of Tucker's negative witnesses (when $\mathcal{M} \notin \mathbb{M}$).

In the graph theoretical community there is a common thought "that specific properties of UIG models were not much investigated because it is easier to work with the intersection graph of the model" [14]. The *minimal UIG-representation* problem is, perhaps, the paradigmatic counterexample to such thought. By definition, a UIG model $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to an infinite number of $(c, \ell, 1, 0)$-CA models, and any of them can be the output of a UIG-representation algorithm. Consequently, there is no natural interpretation of the positions of the arcs in the output $\mathcal{U}$. In some applications there is a motivation to find a canonical model $\mathcal{U}$ that satisfies certain minimality constraints [2, 3, 7–9, 11]. In fact, the minimal UIG-representation problem is mentioned already in the seminal work by Goodman [12].

Despite the interest in computing minimal models, there was some controversy on what constitutes a good definition of minimality. The inconvenience is that there are, at least, three competing parameters that could be minimized: 1. the length of the arcs; 2. the circumference of the circle; and 3. the position of the extremes. Certainly, we can chose to minimize one parameter at a time; the question, then, is which parameter should be considered first and why. Pirlot's proposal is to minimize all these parameters simultaneously. That is, Pirlot [20] defines an (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model $\mathcal{M}$ with arcs $A_1 < \ldots < A_n$ as being *(weakly) (d, d_s)-minimal* when $\ell \leq \ell'$ and $c \leq c'$ for every (c', ℓ', d, d_s)-CA model with arcs $A'_1 < \ldots < A'_n$ equivalent to $\mathcal{U}$. If also $s(A_i) \leq s(A'_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\mathcal{U}$ is *strongly (d, d_s)-minimal*. Of course, these definitions are irrelevant unless one can prove the existence of minimal models. Pirlot [20] (see also [24]) proves the following properties of minimal UIG models:

Existence: every PIG model $\mathcal{U}$ is equivalent to some strongly (d, d_s)-minimal model.

Uniqueness: all the strongly (d, d_s)-minimal models equivalent to $\mathcal{U}$ are equal.

Integrality: if $\mathcal{U}$ is a minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, then c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s.

To prove the existence of minimal UIG models, Pirlot introduces a new space-efficient representation for PIG models, called *synthetic graphs*. Mitas [19] observed that synthetic graphs admit peculiar plane drawings that can be exploited to solve the minimal representation problem in $O(n^2)$ time. (**N.B.** Even though Mitas' original algorithm is linear, it has a mistake and the correct version requires quadratic time [24].) Despite Pirlot's and Mitas' articles appeared more than a quarter of century ago, they seem to have gone unnoticed to many researchers in the graph theoretical community (see [24]). Indeed, new algorithms to compute "minimal" UIG models appeared in the last decade, that require more time or space than the one by Mitas (e.g. [2, 5]). Moreover, the notion of "minimality" in these algorithms is weaker than the one given by Pirlot. According to [24], one reason why [19, 20] were ignored could be that they are written in terms of semiorders. In a recent article, Klavík et al. [14] rediscovered synthetic graphs to solve the *bounded representation problem* on UIG models in almost quadratic time.

In this article we are concerned with the minimal representation problem when general UCA models are allowed as input. The same reasons given by Goodman [12] and Pirlot [20] for UIG models serve to motivate the study of this general problem. Yet, to the best of our knowledge, no advances were made until 2014, when Soulignac [24] proved that every UCA model $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to some (weakly) minimal UCA model. In the same article, Soulignac conjectured that c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s when $\mathcal{M}$ is a minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model. From a technical point of view, the main tool in [24] is a generalization of synthetic graphs that represents general PCA models. In Soulignac's words, one of his main contributions is to show that synthetic graphs are a powerful tool for studying numerical problems on UCA models. To support this conclusion, he shows the first quadratic algorithm to solve the bounded representation problem, the first (unified) certifying algorithm to transform a PCA model into a UCA model in linear time or logspace, and the first pseudo-polynomial algorithm to solve the minimal representation problem. The last algorithm is correct under the assumption that the integrality conjecture holds, and it runs in $O((d + d_s)n^4 \log(n(d + d_s)))$ time.

1.1 Contributions and Outline

The main result of our paper is Theorem 1, whose proof appears in Section 5.

Theorem 1. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, then c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s.*

To prove Theorem 1, we apply a new characterization of the family $\mathbb{M}$ of PCA models that have equivalent UCA models. As mentioned in the Introduction, the first characterization of $\mathbb{M}$ was given by Tucker [25]. Translated to the language of synthetic graphs (see [24]), the characterization states that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}$ if and only if the maximum among the "ratios" of the "greedy nose cycles" of $\mathcal{S}$ is lower than the minimum among the "ratios" of the "greedy hollow cycles" of $\mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the synthetic graph of $\mathcal{M}$. (See Section 3 for definitions.) Tucker's theorem is the basis for the three known polynomial algorithms that output a negative witness certifying that $\mathcal{M} \notin \mathbb{M}$ [4, 13, 24]. In a nutshell, these algorithms compute all the greedy nose and hollow cycles, and then they compare their ratios. Our characterization (Theorem 14), briefly described as Theorem 2, has two advantages over the one by Tucker. On the one hand, it simplifies the recognition of $\mathbb{M}$ as it guarantees that only one greedy nose and greedy hollow cycles need to be considered. On the other hand, it simplifies the criterion for the recognition, as no ratio has to be computed.

Theorem 2. *$\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{M}$ if and only if $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ have a vertex in common, for whatever "nose-like" cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ and "hollow-like" cycle $\mathcal{W}_H$ of $\mathcal{S}$.*

With the aid of a weighing sep_u, the synthetic graph $\mathcal{S}$ of a PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ can be used to determine if $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a u-CA model $\mathcal{U}$. In short, $\mathcal{U}$ exists if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ has no cycles of positive weight [24]. It is not hard to prove (see Lemma 8) that $\mathcal{S}$ has a nose-like cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ and a hollow-like cycle $\mathcal{W}_H$ with $\text{sep}_u = 0$, when $\mathcal{U}$ is minimal. We exploit this observation to prove Theorem 1. The idea is to apply a "loop unrolling" technique similar to that used for computer programs. Loosely speaking, we replicate the arcs of $\mathcal{M}$ in a new circle C' that has space for κ copies of $\mathcal{M}$. The key observation is that the circuits $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ of $\mathcal{S}$ get transformed into walks $\mathcal{T}_N$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$ of the synthetic graph $\kappa\cdot\mathcal{S}$ that represents the model $\kappa\cdot\mathcal{M}$ so obtained. To prove Theorem 2, we observe that $\mathcal{T}_N$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$ have a vertex A in common, and so do $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$. Then, since $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ have maximum sep_u, we can generate a new circuit $\mathcal{W}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ with $\text{sep}_u = 0$ by traversing $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ several times from A. The particularity of $\mathcal{W}$ is that it encodes a circuit $\mathcal{T}$ of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, when κ is large enough, the arcs of $\mathcal{T}$ cannot cover the whole circle of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$. Thus, if we remove the arcs not in $\mathcal{T}$ from $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$ we obtain a UIG model that is minimal because $\text{sep}_u = 0$ for $\mathcal{T}$. By Pirlot's integrality property [20], we can assure that the minimum ℓ for both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$ is an integer combination of d and d_s.

The above proof is of an algorithmic nature, as we can run Mitas' algorithm on $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$ to compute ℓ. Once ℓ is known, c is obtained easily. The complexity of the algorithm depends on how large κ is; we prove that $\kappa = O(n)$, see Section 5.

Theorem 3. *Given a UCA model $\mathcal{U}$ and two values $d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model can be computed in $O(n^3)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space.*

2 Preliminaries

In this article we work with a generalization of digraphs, called q-digraphs. For $q \in \mathbb{N}$, a *q-digraph* is a $(q+1)$-tuple $D = (V, E_1, \ldots, E_q)$ such that (V, E_i) is a digraph that can contain loops but not multiple edges, for $1 \leq i \leq q$. We write $V(D) = V$ and $E(D) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} E_i$ to denote the set of *vertices* and bag of *edges* of D, respectively, and $n = |V(D)|$ and $m = |E(D)|$. For any pair $u, v \in V(D)$, we interchangeably write uv or $u \to v$ to denote the ordered pair (u, v). In some occasions we may refer to uv as being an edge *from* (or *beginning at*) u *to* (or *ending at*) v, regardless of whether $uv \in E(D)$.

A walk W in a q-digraph D is a sequence of edges $v_1v_2, v_2v_3 \ldots, v_{k-1}v_k$ of G. Walk W goes *from* (or *begins at)* v_1 *to* (or *ends at*) v_k. We say that W is a circuit when $v_k = v_1$, that W is a *path* when $v_i \neq v_j$ for every $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, and that W is a *cycle* when it is a circuit and $v_1v_2, \ldots, v_{k-2}v_{k-1}$ is a path. If D contains no cycles, then D is *acyclic*. For the sake of notation, we could say that W is a *circuit* when $v_1 \neq v_k$; this means that W, v_kv_1 is a circuit. Moreover, we may write that a sequence of vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ is a *walk* of D to express that some sequence of edges $v_1v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1}v_k$ is a walk of D. Both conventions are ambiguous, as there could be q edges from v_i to v_{i+1} (or from v_k to v_1 in the former case). In general, the edge represented by v_iv_{i+1} is clear by context; if not, then v_iv_{i+1} refers to any of the edges from v_i to v_{i+1}.

An *edge weighing*, or simply a *weighing*, of a q-digraph D is a function $w\colon E(D) \to \mathbb{R}$. The value $w(uv)$ is referred to as the *weight* of uv (with respect to w). For any bag of edges E, the *weight* of E (with respect to an edge weighing w) is $w(E) = \sum_{uv \in E} w(uv)$.

When traversing the circle of a PCA model $\mathcal{M} = (C, \mathcal{A})$, we always choose the clockwise direction. The set of *extremes* of $\mathcal{M}$ is formed by all the extremes of the arcs in $\mathcal{A}$. In this article we assume that no pair of extremes of $\mathcal{M}$ coincide. An ordered pair of extremes e_1e_2 of $\mathcal{M}$ is *consecutive* when there is no extreme $e \in (e_1, e_2)$ (note that e_2e_1 is not consecutive in this case, unless $|\mathcal{A}| = 1$). We classify the arcs of $\mathcal{A}$ as being *external* or *internal* according to whether they cross 0 or not, respectively. Note that a PCA model is PIG if and only if it

contains no external arcs.

By definition, two PCA models $\mathcal{M}_1 = (C_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 = (C_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$ are *equal* when $C_1 = C_2$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_2$. In the Introduction we loosely defined $\mathcal{M}_1$ as being *equivalent* to $\mathcal{M}_2$ when the extremes of $\mathcal{M}_1$ appear in the same order as in $\mathcal{M}_2$ in the traversals of C_1 and C_2 from their respective 0 points. Formally, $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are equivalent if there exists $f\colon \mathcal{A}_1 \to \mathcal{A}_2$ such that $e(f(A)) < e'(f(B))$ if and only if $e(A) < e'(B)$, for $e, e' \in \{s, t\}$. By definition, $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are equivalent whenever they are equal.

Recall that a (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ with arcs $A_1 < \ldots < A_n$ is (d, d_s)-*minimal* when $\ell \leq \ell'$ and $c \leq c'$ for every (c', ℓ', d, d_s)-CA model with arcs $A'_1 < \ldots < A'_n$ equivalent to $\mathcal{U}$. If also $s(A_i) \leq s(A'_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\mathcal{U}$ is *strongly* (d, d_s)-*minimal*. Note that 0 plays no role in the definition of minimality, while it plays a central role in the definition of strong minimality. The following results, that are taken for granted and will not be referenced, summarize some of the current knowledge about minimal models.

Theorem 4 ([20, 24])**.** *Every UCA (resp. UIG) model is equivalent to some (resp. strongly) (d, d_s)-minimal UCA model, for all $d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Theorem 5 ([20])**.** *If a (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ wit no external arcs is (d, d_s)-minimal, then c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s.*

3 Synthetic graphs of PCA and PIG models

Synthetic graphs were defined by Pirlot [20] to study the separation constraints that the extremes of a PIG model must satisfy in any equivalent UIG model. Recently, Soulignac [24] extended Pirlot's definition to PCA models. Despite the original motivations behind their definition, synthetic graphs are also a valid representation of general PCA models. Thus, we can gain more information about PCA models by taking a closer look to their particular structure. In this section we introduce synthetic graphs while we review what is known about them.

Let $\mathcal{M} = (C, \mathcal{A})$ be a PCA model with arcs $A_1 < \ldots < A_n$. The *synthetic graph* of $\mathcal{M}$ is the 3-digraph $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ (see Figure 1(b)) that has a vertex $v(A_i)$ for each $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and whose bag of edges is $E_\sigma \cup E_\nu \cup E_\eta$, where:

- $E_\sigma = \{v(A_i) \to v(A_{i+1}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n,\ A_{n+1} = A_1\}$,
- $E_\nu = \{v(A_i) \to v(A_j) \mid t(A_i)s(A_j)$ are consecutive in $\mathcal{M}\}$,
- $E_\eta = \{v(A_i) \to v(A_j) \mid s(A_i)t(A_j)$ are consecutive in $\mathcal{M}\}$, and

The edges in E_σ, E_ν, and E_η are the *steps*, *noses*, and *hollows* of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$, respectively. Observe that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ could have loops or multiple edges joining the same pair of vertices. Indeed, every PIG model has a nose $v(A_n) \to v(A_1)$ and a step $v(A_n) \to v(A_1)$, while every "isolated" arc has a loop to itself. For the sake of simplicity, we drop the parameter $\mathcal{M}$ from $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ when no ambiguities are possible. Note that $\mathcal{S}$ *represents* $\mathcal{M}$ up to equivalence, i.e., $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M}')$ are isomorphic if and only if $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are equivalent, for every PCA model $\mathcal{M}'$. For this reason, we implicitly consider some definitions on $\mathcal{S}$ as being valid for $\mathcal{M}$, and vice versa. Moreover, we regard the arcs of $\mathcal{M}$ as being the vertices of $\mathcal{S}$, thus we may say that $A_i \to A_j$ is a nose instead of writing that $v(A_i) \to v(A_j)$ is a nose.

Following [24], we classify the edges of $\mathcal{S}$ as being internal or external according the way they interact with respect to the point 0. That is, a step (resp. nose) $A_i \to A_j$ is *internal* (resp. *external*) if and only if $(s(A_i), s(A_j))$ is internal (resp. *external*), while a hollow $A_i \to A_j$ is *internal* if and only if $(s(A_j), s(A_i))$ is internal (resp. *external*). In other words, a step (resp. nose) $A_i \to A_j$ is *internal* when $A_i < A_j$, while a hollow is *internal* when $A_i > A_j$.



Figure 1: (a) A PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ with arcs $A_1 < A_2 < A_3 < A_4$, (b) its synthetic graph $\mathcal{S}$, and (c) Mitas' drawing of $\mathcal{S}$ with backward edges and row numbers. Solid, dashed, and dotted lines represent noses, hollows, and steps, respectively, while gray lines represent external edges (b) and backward edges (c).

Each UCA descriptor u implies an edge weighing sep_u of $\mathcal{S}$ whose purpose is to indicate how far or close $s(A_i)$ and $s(A_j)$ must be in any u-CA model equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$, for every edge $A_i \to A_j$ of $\mathcal{S}$. The edge weighing sep_u is such that, for every $1 \le i, j \le n$:

(sep_1) $\mathrm{sep}_u(A_i \to A_j) = d + d_s - cq$ if $A_i \to A_j$ is a step,

(sep_2) $\mathrm{sep}_u(A_i \to A_j) = d + \ell - cq$ if $A_i \to A_j$ is a nose, and

(sep_3) $\mathrm{sep}_u(A_i \to A_j) = d - \ell + cq$ if $A_i \to A_j$ is a hollow.

where $q \in \{0, 1\}$ equals 0 if and only if $A_i \to A_j$ is internal. The following theorem shows how sep_u can be used to determine if $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a u-CA model. The theorem is a generalization of [20, Proposition 2.5] and [14, Proposition 4.4] that work only for PIG models.

Theorem 6 ([24])**.** *For a UCA descriptor u, a PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a u-CA model if and only if $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \le 0$ for every cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$.*

The weighing sep_u also defines a u-CA model equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$, that can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time and $O(n)$ space.

Theorem 7 ([24])**.** *The problem of determining if a given PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a u-CA model, for a given UCA descriptor u, can be solved in $O(n^2)$ time and $O(n)$ space. The algorithm outputs either a u-CA model equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$ or a cycle of $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) > 0$.*

Decreasing c as much as possible, we observe that $\mathcal{S}$ must contain a cycle with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$ when $\mathcal{U}$ is (d, d_s)-minimal. As a matter of fact, $\mathcal{S}$ must contain at least two cycles with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$. Let $\nu(\mathcal{W})$, $\eta(\mathcal{W})$, and $\sigma(\mathcal{W})$ (resp. $\nu_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W})$, $\eta_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W})$, and $\sigma_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W})$) be the number of (resp. external) noses, hollows, and steps of a walk $\mathcal{W}$, respectively. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) &= \ell\,\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) + c\,\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}) + d|\mathcal{W}| + d_s\sigma(\mathcal{W}), \text{ where} \\ \mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) &= \nu(\mathcal{W}) - \eta(\mathcal{W}), \text{ and} \\ \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}) &= \eta_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W}) - \nu_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W}) - \sigma_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{W}). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Lemma 8. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model, then $\mathcal{S}$ has circuits $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_N) = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_H) = 0$ such that $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) < 0$ and $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_H) \ge 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{U}$ is a u-CA model for $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$, and let

$$\Delta = \min\{-\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \mid \mathcal{W} \text{ is a cycle of } \mathcal{S} \text{ with } \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \neq 0\},$$

which is positive by Theorem 6. Consider the following two cases.

Case 1: $\mathrm{ext} \geq 0$ for every cycle with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$. Let $v = (c - \frac{\Delta}{2n}, \ell, d, d_s)$ be a UCA descriptor. By (1) and the fact that $|\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W})| \leq n$ is an integer value for every cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{sep}_v(\mathcal{W}) = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) - \frac{\Delta\,\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W})}{2n} \leq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = 0 \\ -\Delta + \frac{\Delta}{2} = -\frac{\Delta}{2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{U}$ is equivalent to a v-CA by Theorem 6, implying that $\mathcal{U}$ is not (d, d_s)-minimal.

Case 2: $\mathrm{ext} < 0$ for every cycle with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$. Let $v = (c + \frac{\Delta}{4n^2}, \ell - \frac{\Delta}{2n}, d, d_s)$ be a UCA descriptor. By (1) and the facts that $|\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W})| \leq n$ is integer and $|\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W})| \leq n$ for every cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{sep}_v(\mathcal{W}) = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) - \frac{\Delta\,\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W})}{4n^2} + \frac{\Delta\,\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W})}{2n} \leq \begin{cases} 0 + \frac{\Delta}{4n} - \frac{\Delta}{2n} = -\frac{\Delta}{4n} & \text{if } \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = 0 \\ -\Delta + \frac{\Delta}{4n} + \frac{\Delta}{2} \leq -\frac{\Delta}{4n} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As in Case 1, $\mathcal{U}$ is not (d, d_s)-minimal.

□

The idea to prove that ℓ is integer is to observe that every (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model has a circuit $\mathcal{W}_0$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u = \mathrm{ext} = 0$. Then, the special structure of $\mathcal{S}$ allows us to conclude that ℓ is integer. To find $\mathcal{W}_0$, the idea is to traverse a circuit $\mathcal{W}_N$ with $\mathrm{ext} < 0$ followed by a circuit $\mathcal{W}_H$ with $\mathrm{ext} = -\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$. Of course, this traversal is possible only when $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ have a vertex in common. In a similar way, we prove that c is integer by finding a circuit with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$ and $\mathrm{ext} = -1$. The following section delves into the structure of synthetic graphs.

3.1 The structure of synthetic graphs

Mitas [19] observed that synthetic graphs admit peculiar drawings that can be exploited to understand the structure of $\mathcal{M}$ with simple arguments. In these drawings, each vertex A occupies an entry of an imaginary matrix whose position is defined by the "row" and "column" of A. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a PCA model with arcs $A_1 < \ldots < A_n$. The *row* of A_i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ is recursively defined as follows:

$$\mathrm{row}(A_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s(A_i) < t(A_1) \\ 1 + \mathrm{row}(A_j) & \text{otherwise, where } A_j = \max\{A_j \mid t(A_j) < s(A_i)\}. \end{cases}$$

The *number of rows* of $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathrm{rows}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{row}(A_n) + 1$.[1] The sequence $A_j < \ldots < A_k$ of arcs with row r, for $0 \leq r < \mathrm{rows}(\mathcal{M})$, is the *row* r of $\mathcal{M}$, while A_j and A_k are the *leftmost* and *rightmost* at row r. Note that $\mathrm{row}(A) = r$ if and only if A belongs to row r. Figure 1(c) depicts the rows of the vertices for a synthetic graph.

Say that a step (resp. nose, hollow) $A_i \to A_j$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is a δ-step (resp. δ-nose, δ-hollow) when $\mathrm{row}(A_j) - \mathrm{row}(A_i) = \delta$. We refer to the 0-steps, 1-noses, and (-1)-hollows as being *forward* edges, and to the 1-steps and 0-hollows as being *backward* edges. It is not hard to see that all the internal edges are either forward or backward, thus there are five kinds of internal edges. Similarly, $\mathcal{S}$ has five kinds of external edges: $(-r)$-noses, $(1-r)$-noses, r-hollows, $(r-1)$-hollows, and the $(-r)$-step $A_n \to A_1$; here $r = \mathrm{rows}(\mathcal{S})$. We say a walk $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is *internal*

[1] N.B.: Mitas [19] (and also Soulignac [24]) refers to $\mathrm{row}(A)$ as being the *height* $h(A)$ of A, because $h(A)$ is the height of A in some order.

when it contains only internal edges, and that is *forward* when it contains only forward edges. Clearly, $\mathcal{W}$ is forward only if it is internal.

A key observation by Mitas is that the 3-digraph $\mathcal{L}$ obtained after removing the external and backward edges of $\mathcal{S}$ is acyclic. This fact allows us to define the column of the vertices in $\mathcal{S}$ using the following recurrence. The *column* A_1 is $\mathrm{col}(A_1) = 0$, while, for every $1 < i \leq n$, the *column* of A_i is:

$$\mathrm{col}(A_i) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c|l} \mathrm{col}(N) + \varepsilon & N \to A_i \text{ is a 1-nose} \\ \mathrm{col}(H) + 1 & H \to A_i \text{ is a } (-1)\text{-hollow} \\ \mathrm{col}(S) + 1 & S \to A_i \text{ is a 0-step} \end{array} \right\} \tag{2}$$

for a small enough ε (say $\varepsilon \ll 1/n$); obviously, if A_i is not the end of a nose (resp. hollow, step), then the corresponding value in the above equation is 0.

Mitas' drawing of $\mathcal{L}$ is obtained by placing each vertex A_i in the plane at point $\mathrm{pos}(A_i) = (\mathrm{row}(A_i), \mathrm{col}(A_i))$, and joining $\mathrm{pos}(A_i)$ with $\mathrm{pos}(A_j)$ with a straight line $L(A_iA_j)$, for each edge $A_i \to A_j$ of $\mathcal{L}$ (see Figure 1(c)). Let $\mathcal{W} = B_1, \ldots, B_k$ be a forward walk $\mathcal{S}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{W}$ is also a walk of $\mathcal{L}$, hence $\mathrm{col}(B_{i+1}) > \mathrm{col}(B_i)$, for every $1 \leq i < k$. Thus, the curve $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W})$ obtained by traversing $L(B_iB_{i+1})$ after $L(B_{i-1}B_i)$, for $1 < i < k$, is the graph of a continuous function.

Lemma 9 ([19, 24])**.** *If $\mathcal{W}$ is a forward walk of $\mathcal{S}$, then $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W})$ is the graph of a continuous function in $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.*

By removing the backward edges of an internal walk $\mathcal{W}$, we obtain a family of forward walks $\mathcal{W}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_k$. We define the *drawing* of $\mathcal{W}$ to be $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}) = \bigcup\{\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. The reason why Mitas' drawing of $\mathcal{L}$ is so attractive resides in the fact that it is a "plane" drawing. The theorem below expresses this condition in terms of the drawings of the internal walks.

Theorem 10 ([19, 24])**.** *Two internal walks $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathcal{S}$ have a common vertex if and only if $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}') \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, A is a vertex common to $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$ if and only if $\mathrm{pos}(A) \in \mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}')$.*

Suppose, for a moment, that $\mathcal{M}$ is a PIG model. By taking a large enough value for c, we observe that $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \leq 0$ for every non-internal cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$. Thus, only internal cycles are of interest when we are looking for the minimal length value of a UIG model $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$. This fact, combined with (1) and Lemma 11 below, is enough to prove that ℓ is an integer combination of d and d_s when $\mathcal{U}$ is (d, d_s)-minimal.

Lemma 11 ([20, 24])**.** *If $\mathcal{W}$ is internal cycle (resp. circuit) of $\mathcal{S}$, then $\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) = -1$ (resp. $\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) < 0$).*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{W}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_k$ be the family of walks obtained after removing all the backward edges of a cycle $\mathcal{W}$. Let A_i and B_i be the first and last vertices of $\mathcal{W}_i$, and suppose $B_i \to A_{i+1}$ is a backward edge for $1 \leq i \leq k$ (here $A_{k+1} = A_1$). By Theorem 10, $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}_i)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}_j)$ have no points in common when $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Moreover, by Lemma 9, $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}_i)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathcal{W}_{i+1})$ are the graphs of continuous functions. Then, since $\mathrm{row}(B_i) + 1 \geq \mathrm{row}(A_{i+1})$, we obtain that $k = 1$. That is, $\mathcal{W}$ has only one backward edge. □

Although the above proof is the same as the one in [24], we include it here for two reasons. First, to highlight the utility of Mitas' drawings. Second, because similar arguments are required in the forthcoming sections to prove that two walks $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}'$ have a common vertex. Since this geometrical arguments are intuitive, we shall not include them in the following sections. Instead, we just leave a reference to Lemma 9 and Theorem 10.

4 A new characterization of UCA models

The first characterization of those PCA models that are equivalent to UCA models was given by Tucker [25]. Soulignac [24] translated Tucker's characterization to the language of synthetic graphs, using the so-called nose and hollow cycles. A walk $\mathcal{W} = B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is a *nose walk* (resp. *hollow walk*) when it contains no hollows (resp. noses). We say that B_i is *greedy (in $\mathcal{W}_N$)* when either the edge $B_i \to B_{i+1}$ of $\mathcal{W}_N$ is a nose (resp. hollow) or no nose (resp. hollow) of $\mathcal{S}$ starts at B_i. A nose (resp. hollow) walk is *greedy* when all its vertices are greedy. In other words, $\mathcal{W}_N$ is greedy when noses (resp. hollows) are preferred over steps. Note that a walk is both a nose and a hollow walk if only if all its edges are steps; such walks are referred to as *step walks*. Theorem 12 sums up Tucker's characterization; for simplicity, we omit the definition of the *ratio* $r(\mathcal{W})$ of $\mathcal{W}$ (see [24]).

Theorem 12 ([24, 25])**.** *A PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ has equivalent UCA models if and only $r(\mathcal{W}_N) < r(\mathcal{W}_H)$ for every greedy nose cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ and every greedy hollow cycle $\mathcal{W}_H$ of $\mathcal{S}$.*

In this section we provide a new characterization of UCA models that has two advantages over Theorem 12. On the one hand, it guarantees that only one greedy nose and one greedy hollow cycle need to be considered while, on the other hand, it simplifies the criterion for the recognition, as no ratio has to be computed. On the technical side, the proof exploits a simple "loop unrolling" technique that, loosely speaking, transforms every PCA model $\mathcal{M}$ into a PIG model. This allows us to take advantage of Mitas' drawings on $\mathcal{M}$.

Let c be the circumference of the circle of a PCA model $\mathcal{M}$. The *κ-unrolling* of $\mathcal{M}$ (Figure 2) is the PCA model $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$ whose circle has circumference κc that has κ arcs $A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_{\kappa-1}$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that, for $0 \leq i < \kappa$:

$$s(A_i) = s(A) + ic, \text{ and } t(A_i) = t(A) + (i+q)c \bmod \kappa c,$$

where $q \in \{0, 1\}$ equals 1 if and only if A is external. For convenience, we write $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{M})$ as a shortcut for $\mathcal{S}(\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M})$, and we drop the parameter $\mathcal{M}$ as usual. By definition, the arc A_i of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{M}$ is a vertex of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$. We refer to A_i as being the *i-th copy* of A, and to i as being its *copy number*; sometimes we also say that A_i is the *i-th copy* of A_j for $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$. Similarly, each edge $A_i \to B_j$ of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is said to be a *copy* of the edge $A \to B$ of $\mathcal{S}$ to indicate that $A_i \to B_j$ is of the same kind as $A \to B$ and that B_j is a copy of B. Note that $A \to B$ has κ copies in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ by definition. Moreover, if j is the copy number of B_j, then:

$$j = \begin{cases} i & \text{if and only if } A \to B \text{ is internal,} \\ i+1 & \text{if and only if } A \to B \text{ is an external nose or step, and} \\ i-1 & \text{if and only if } A \to B \text{ is an external hollow.} \end{cases}$$

where all the operations are modulo κ. We remark that $\mathrm{row}(B_j) - \mathrm{row}(A_i)$ need not be equal to $\mathrm{row}(B) - \mathrm{row}(A)$, thus the δ-noses (resp. δ-hollows, δ-steps) of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ do not correspond to the δ-noses (resp. δ-hollows, δ-steps) of $\mathcal{S}$.

The concept of a copy from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is also valid for the walks of $\mathcal{S}$. That is, a walk $\mathcal{T} = T_1, \ldots, T_k$ is a *copy* of a walk $\mathcal{W} = B_1, \ldots, B_k$ when $T_i \to T_{i+1}$ is a copy of $B_i \to B_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. For circuits, however, we prefer to use a generalization of this concept. We say a walk $\mathcal{T} = T_1, \ldots, T_{q+1}$ of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is a *travel* of a circuit $\mathcal{W} = B_1, \ldots, B_k, B_1$ to mean that $T_i \to T_{i+1}$ is a copy of $W_{i \bmod k} \to W_{i+1 \bmod k}$, for every $1 \leq i \leq q$. Sometimes we also refer to $\mathcal{T}$ as being *obtained by traveling $\mathcal{W}$ from T_1 to T_{q+1}*. Moreover, if $q = k\kappa$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (so T_{q+1} is a copy of B_1), then we also call $\mathcal{T}$ a *k-travel* of $\mathcal{W}$, and we say that $\mathcal{T}$ is *obtained by k-traveling $\mathcal{W}$ from T_1*. Note that $\mathcal{T}$ is a copy of $\mathcal{W}$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}$ is a 1-travel of $\mathcal{W}$.



Figure 2: (a) $2 \cdot \mathcal{M}$ for the model $\mathcal{M}$ in Figure 1, where A_i^j is the j-th copy of A_i. (b) Mitas' drawing of $2 \cdot \mathcal{S}$ with backward edges; its aligning row is 1 and its period is 2.

Let A_1 be the leftmost vertex at row 0 of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$, and $B_i \to B_{i+1}$ be the i-th nose of the be greedy nose walk $\mathcal{T}$ that begins at A_1 and ends at a vertex at row $r = \text{rows}(\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}) - 1$. For κ sufficiently large, say $\kappa \geq 2n$, $\mathcal{T}$ contains two copies B_β and $B_{\beta+\rho}$ of the same vertex. The minimum among all the feasible values for β and ρ are called the *aligning row* and the *period* of $\mathcal{S}$, respectively (Figure 2(b)). Clearly, A_1 is a copy of the minimum arc of $\mathcal{M}$, while, by induction, B_i is the leftmost vertex at row i of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. This implies that the subwalk of $\mathcal{T}$ that begins at B_β and ends at $B_{\beta+\rho}$ is a copy of a greedy nose cycle. Therefore, the j-th vertex at row $\beta+\rho+i$ must be a copy of the j-th vertex at row $\beta+i$, for every possible combination of i and j.

Observation 13. *If β are ρ are the aligning row and period of $\mathcal{S}$, respectively, then the j-th vertex at row $\beta + \rho + i$ of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is a copy of the j-th vertex at row $\beta + i$ of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$, for all the appropriate values of i, j, κ.*

Consider a walk $\mathcal{W} = B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of $\mathcal{S}$, and let β be the aligning row of $\mathcal{S}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\kappa > 2(n+k+q)$, then B_1 has a copy T_1 in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ with $n+k+q \leq \text{row}(\mathcal{T}_1) < 2n+k+q$. Then, since the q-travel $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ that begins at T_1 has kq edges, we obtain that the row of every vertex in $\mathcal{T}$ is at least n and at most $2(n+q+r) < \text{rows}(\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S})$. This implies that $\mathcal{T}$ is an internal walk whose vertices are all at rows greater than β. We refer to such κ as being *large enough* for $\mathcal{W}$ and q. Formally, κ is *large enough* for $\mathcal{W}$ and q when $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ has an internal q-travel of $\mathcal{W}$ whose vertices are all at rows greater than β. As described above, there always exists a large enough value for $\mathcal{W}$ and q. In the remainder of this article we refer to κ as being *large enough* without specifying for which walk $\mathcal{W}$ or value of q. The reason is that we need if convenient to define κ before knowing the family of walks for which it has to be large enough. Of course, an explicit value for κ can be obtained afterwards by looking at all the involved walks.

The characterization of UCA models appears in the next theorem. For simplicity, we write $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{W}) = -\text{sgn}(\text{ext}(\mathcal{W}))$ for every walk $\mathcal{W}$, and we refer to $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{W})$ as being the *signum* of $\mathcal{W}$. Observe that every nose walk has sgn ≥ 0, while every hollow walk has sgn ≤ 0, thus sgn generalizes the concept of nose and hollow walks. In terms of the unrolling of $\mathcal{S}$, note that $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{W}) = \text{sgn}(\text{row}(T_k) - \text{row}(T_1))$ for every interval travel $\mathcal{T} = T_1, \ldots, T_k$ of a circuit $\mathcal{W}$. Intuitively, $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{W})$ indicates whether the travels of $\mathcal{W}$ go up or down in the unrolling.

Theorem 14. *The following statements are equivalent for a PCA model $\mathcal{M}$.*

(i) $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a UCA model.

(ii) Every pair of circuits of $\mathcal{S}$ with different signum have a common vertex.

(iii) Some greedy hollow cycle of $\mathcal{S}$ has a vertex in common to some greedy nose cycle of $\mathcal{S}$.

Proof. (i) ⇒ (ii). Let $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ be circuits with $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_H) \leq 0 \leq \operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_N)$, β and ρ be the aligning row and period of $\mathcal{S}$, and $\mathcal{L} = \kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ for a large enough κ. For the time being, suppose $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_H) < 0 < \operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_N)$. Since κ is large enough, $\mathcal{L}$ has an internal ρ-travel $\mathcal{T}_N$ of $\mathcal{W}_N$ whose vertices all belong to rows higher than β. Suppose $\mathcal{T}_N$ goes from a vertex N_x at row x to a copy N_y of N_x at a row $y > x$.

Since $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_H) < 0$, it follows that some vertex of $\mathcal{W}_H$ has a copy H_y at row y in $\mathcal{L}$. Among all such possible H_y, take the one such that $H_y \geq H$ for every copy H of a vertex in $\mathcal{W}_H$ at row y. By Observation 13, H_y has a copy H_x at row x because $y - x$ is a multiple of ρ. Moreover, $H_x \geq H$ for every copy H of a vertex in $\mathcal{W}_H$ at row x. Thus, by traveling $\mathcal{W}_H$, we obtain a walk $\mathcal{T}_H$ in $\mathcal{L}$ that begins at H_y and ends at a vertex $A \leq H_x$ at row x. Since κ is large enough, we obtain that $\mathcal{T}_H$ is internal, and so is the walk $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ obtained by traversing $\mathcal{T}_H$ plus the step path from A to H_x.

Clearly, $\mathcal{T}$ is the copy of some circuit $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) = -\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$ because $\mathcal{T}$ begins at row y and ends at row x. Let σ be the number of 1-steps in $\mathcal{T}_N$ and η be the number of 0-hollows in $\mathcal{T}$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is UCA, Theorem 6 implies the existence of a UCA descriptor $u = (c, \ell, 1, 0)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_N) &= \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{T}_N) + c\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) \geq (y-x)(\ell+1) - \ell\sigma + c\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) \\ 0 \geq \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) &= \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{T}) + c\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) \geq (y-x+\eta)(1-\ell) - c\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N), \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain that either $\sigma > 0$ or $\eta > 0$. If the former holds, then any (2ρ)-travel of $\mathcal{W}_N$ in $\mathcal{L}$ from N_x has at least two 1-steps. Otherwise, any (ρn)-travel of $\mathcal{W}_H$ in $\mathcal{L}$ that ends at row x has at least two 0-hollows. Note that these travels are internal because κ is large enough. Therefore, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}$ has two internal walks $\mathcal{T}_N$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$, obtained by traveling $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$, respectively, such that:

(a) if $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{T}_N) > 0$, then $\mathcal{T}_N$ begins at row 0 and ends at row $\operatorname{rows}(\mathcal{L}) - 1$,

(b) if $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{T}_H) < 0$, then $\mathcal{T}_H$ begins at row $\operatorname{rows}(\mathcal{L}) - 1$ and ends at row 0, and

(c) either $\mathcal{T}_N$ or $\mathcal{T}_H$ has two backward edges.

Note that (a)–(c) hold as well when either $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_H) = 0$ or $\operatorname{sgn}(\mathcal{W}_N) = 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 9 and Theorem 10, $\mathcal{T}_N$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$ have a common vertex and so do $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$.

(ii) ⇒ (i). Let $u = (c, \ell, 1, 0)$, where $\ell = 2n^2$ and c is the minimum such that $\operatorname{sep}_u \leq 0$ for every cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ with $\operatorname{ext} < 0$. Note that such a UCA descriptor always exists by (1). Moreover, some cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ of $\mathcal{S}$ with $\operatorname{ext} < 0$ has $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$. We claim that $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a u-CA model. By Theorem 6 it suffices to observe that $\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \leq 0$ for every cycle $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$. Consider the following cases.

Case 1: $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) < 0$. Then $\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) \leq 0$ by the definition of c.

Case 2: $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) = 0$. This follows by (1) and Lemma 11 because $|\mathcal{W}| \leq n$.

Case 3: $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) > 0$. By hypothesis, $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}_N$ have a common vertex A. Let $\mathcal{W}_0$ be the circuit of $\mathcal{S}$ that begins at A which is obtained by traversing $|\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)|$ times $\mathcal{W}$ and then $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W})$ times $\mathcal{W}_N$. Since $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_0) = 0$ by construction, it follows that any copy of $\mathcal{W}_0$ in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is an internal circuit when κ is large enough. Note that:

$$\sigma(\mathcal{W}_0) \leq |\mathcal{W}_0| = |\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)||\mathcal{W}| + \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W})|\mathcal{W}_N| \leq 2n^2 = \ell.$$

Hence, by (1) and Lemma 11,

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)|\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) &= |\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)|\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) + \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W})\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_N) = \\ &= \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_0) = (\ell+1)\operatorname{jmp}(\mathcal{W}_0) + \sigma(\mathcal{W}_0) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

(ii) ⇒ (iii). Trivial.

(iii) ⇒ (ii). Suppose some greedy nose cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ has a vertex A in common with a greedy hollow cycle $\mathcal{W}_H$, and let β be the aligning row of $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ for a large enough κ. By the election of κ, $\mathcal{L}$ contains an internal $2\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_H)$-travel $\mathcal{T}_N$ of $\mathcal{W}_N$ that begins at a copy A_0 of A with $\operatorname{row}(A_0) > \beta$. Let i be the copy number of A_0 and $q = |\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_H)\operatorname{ext}(W_N)|$. By construction, $\mathcal{T}_N$ contains the $(i+q)$-th and $(i+2q)$-th copies A_1 and A_2 of A_0. Similarly, the $2|\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)|$-travel $\mathcal{T}_H$ of $\mathcal{W}_H$ that begins at A_2 contains A_1 and ends at A_0.

Observe that $\mathcal{T}_N$ is a greedy nose path of $\mathcal{L}$. Thus, $\mathcal{T}_N$ contains a leftmost vertex only if $\mathcal{T}_N$ contains all the leftmost vertices at rows between $\operatorname{row}(A_0) > \beta$ and $\operatorname{row}(A_2)$. This implies that $\mathcal{T}_N$ has no 1-steps, thus $\mathcal{T}_N$ is forward, i.e., $\operatorname{col}(A_2) > \operatorname{col}(A_1) > \operatorname{col}(A_0)$. By Lemma 9, this means that the subpath of $\mathcal{T}_H$ from A_i to A_{i-1} is not forward for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_H$ contains at least two subpaths $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_2$ that join a leftmost vertex to a rightmost vertex. Let x_i and y_i be the rows of the leftmost and rightmost vertices of $\mathcal{T}_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Any circuit $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ with $\operatorname{sgn} < 0$ has a travel $\mathcal{T}$ that joins a vertex at row $x_i + 1$ with a vertex at row $y_i - 1$. Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ has a vertex B in common with $\mathcal{T}_i$. If the edge $B \to B'$ of $\mathcal{T}$ is a hollow, then $B \to B'$ is also an edge of $\mathcal{T}_i$. By Lemma 9, this means that $\mathcal{T}$ must pass through a backward edge before reaching the level $y_i - 1$. Consequently, $\mathcal{T}$ contains at least two backward edges and, so, by Lemma 9 and Theorem 10, $\mathcal{W}$ has a vertex in common to every circuit with $\operatorname{sgn} \geq 0$. Similarly, by Lemma 9 and Theorem 10, any circuit with $\operatorname{sgn} > 0$ has a vertex in common with every circuit with $\operatorname{sgn} = 0$. □

5 The integrality of c and ℓ

The purpose of this section is to prove that both c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s when $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model, for $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$. For the integrality of ℓ, we apply Lemma 11 after observing that $\mathcal{S}$ contains a "rolled-up" circuit with $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$ and $\operatorname{ext} = 0$. Then, we prove the integrality of c by observing that $\mathcal{S}$ also contains a circuit with $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$ and $\operatorname{ext} = -1$.

Say that a circuit $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ is *rolled-up* when the copy $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is an internal path or cycle. (Here κ is a large enough value for $\mathcal{W}$ and 1.) It is not hard to see that every circuit $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ can be partitioned into a family of rolled-up circuits $\mathcal{W}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_k$. Just note that the copy $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ can be partitioned into at most one path or cycle $\mathcal{T}_1$ and a family of cycles $\mathcal{T}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_k$. So, $\mathcal{T}_i$ is the copy of the rolled-up circuit $\mathcal{W}_i$. Observe also that $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) = \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_1)$, while $\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \operatorname{sep}(\mathcal{W}_i)$. Therefore, by Theorem 6, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model. Then, $\mathcal{S}$ has a circuit $\mathcal{W}$ with $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ has a rolled-up circuit $\mathcal{W}'$ with $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$ and $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}') = \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W})$.*

Lemma 16. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model, then $\mathcal{S}$ contains a rolled-up circuit with $\operatorname{ext} = 0$ and $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$.*

Proof. Let $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$. By Lemma 8, $\mathcal{S}$ has two circuits $\mathcal{W}_N$ and $\mathcal{W}_H$ with $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$ and $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) \leq 0 \leq \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_H)$, that have a common vertex A by Theorem 14. Starting at A, we traverse $|\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)|$ times $\mathcal{W}_H$ and $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}_H)$ times $\mathcal{W}_N$ to obtain a circuit $\mathcal{W}$. Note that $\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) = 0$, thus $\mathcal{S}$ contains the desired rolled-up circuit by Lemma 15. □

Theorem 17. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, then ℓ is an integer combination of d and d_s.*

Proof. Let $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$. By Lemma 16, $\mathcal{S}$ has a rolled-up circuit $\mathcal{W}$ with $\operatorname{ext} = 0$ and $\operatorname{sep}_u = 0$. Since $\operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{W}) = 0$, it follows that $\operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = \operatorname{sep}_u(\mathcal{T})$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the internal copy

of $\mathcal{W}$ in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$, for some large enough κ. Then, by (1) and Lemma 11,

$$0 = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{T}) = \ell \,\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{T}) + d|\mathcal{T}| + d_s\sigma(\mathcal{T}) = -\ell + d|\mathcal{T}| + d_s\sigma(\mathcal{T}) \tag{3}$$

□

Lemma 18. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model, then $\mathcal{S}$ contains a rolled-up circuit with* $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{ext} = -1$.

Proof. By Lemma 15, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{S}$ has a circuit with $\mathrm{ext} = -1$ and $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$. By Lemmas 8 and 16, $\mathcal{S}$ has two circuits $\mathcal{W}_0$ and $\mathcal{W}_N$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$ and $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) < 0 = \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_0)$. We prove that either $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) = -1$ or there exists a circuit $\mathcal{W}$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = 0$ and $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) < \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}) < 0$. In the latter case, the proof follows by induction.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ for a large enough κ, $\mathcal{T}_0$ be an internal copy of $\mathcal{W}_0$, and x and y be the minimum and maximum such that $\mathcal{T}_0$ has vertices with rows x and y, respectively. Since κ is large enough, we may suppose, without loss of generality, that there exist two copies A_1 and A_2 of a vertex $A \in \mathcal{W}_N$ with $\mathrm{row}(A_1) < \mathrm{row}(A_2) < x$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, call q_i to the copy number of A_i and suppose $q_2 = q_1 + 1$. Let $\mathcal{T}_i$ be a travel of $\mathcal{W}_N$ from A_i that ends at a copy A_{-i} of A with $\mathrm{row}(A_{-i}) > y$; note that such a walk exists because $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) < 0$ and κ is large enough. By Lemma 9, $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_0$ have a vertex T_i in common. Call B_i to the copy of A with $\mathrm{row}(B_i) \leq \mathrm{row}(T_i)$ that appears last when traversing $\mathcal{T}_i$ from A_i to T_i, and B_{-i} to the copy of A with $\mathrm{row}(B_{-i}) > \mathrm{row}(B_i)$ that appears first when traversing $\mathcal{T}_i$ from T_i to A_{-i}. Let q_i' be the copy number of B_i and observe that $\mathrm{row}(B_i) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-i}) = \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$.

Let $i, j = \{1, 2\}$. By construction, the walk $\mathcal{T}_i'$ obtained by first traversing $\mathcal{T}_i$ from B_i to T_i, then traversing $\mathcal{T}_0$ from T_i to T_j, and finally traversing $\mathcal{T}_j$ from T_j to B_{-j} is a copy of a circuit $\mathcal{W}_i$ with $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_i) < 0$ such that:

$$\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_i) + \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_j) = \alpha\,\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_N) + \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_0) = 0$$

for some $\alpha \geq 0$. Then, by Theorem 6, it follows that $\mathrm{sep}(\mathcal{W}_i) = \mathrm{sep}(\mathcal{W}_j) = 0$. Without loss of generality, suppose $\mathrm{row}(B_i) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-j}) > \mathrm{row}(B_j) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-i})$. Since $\mathrm{row}(B_i) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-i}) = \mathrm{row}(B_j) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-j}) = \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$, we obtain that either $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_i) = \mathrm{row}(B_i) - \mathrm{row}(B_{-j}) > \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$ or $B_i = B_j$. In the former case, $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_i$ is the desired circuit. In the latter case, the subwalk of $\mathcal{T}_1$ from A_1 to B_1 has $q = q_1' - q_1$ copies of A, while the subwalk of $\mathcal{T}_2$ from A_2 to $B_2 = B_1$ has $q - 1$ copies of A. Hence, $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N)$ is a multiple of both q and $q - 1$, i.e., $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_N) = 1$. □

Theorem 19. *If $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, then c is an integer combination of d and d_s.*

Proof. Let $u = (c, \ell, d, d_s)$ and recall that $\ell = k_1 d + k_2 d_s$, for $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, by Theorem 17. By Lemma 18, $\mathcal{S}$ has a circuit $\mathcal{W}$ with $\mathrm{ext} = -1$ and $\mathrm{sep}_u = 0$. Then, by (1),

$$0 = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}) = c + d(k_1\,\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) + |\mathcal{W}|) + d_s(k_2\,\mathrm{jmp}(\mathcal{W}) + \sigma(\mathcal{W})) \tag{4}$$

□

5.1 Computing a minimal UCA model

This section presents an algorithm to compute a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to an input UCA model $\mathcal{M}$, when $d \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, and $d_s \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ are also given as input. The algorithm has three phases that compute ℓ, c, and $\mathcal{U}$, respectively. The main issue in the first phase is to determine how small can a large enough value be. A good answer is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 20. *For every UCA descriptor u and any circuit $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ with* $\mathrm{ext} = 0$*, there is an internal copy of a circuit $\mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathcal{S}$ in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ such that* $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}') = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}') = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W})$*, where* $\kappa = 3n/(\max\{1, \mathrm{rows}(\mathcal{S}) - 1\})$.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L} = \kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ has at least $3n$ rows. Thus, for any partition $\mathcal{W}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_k$ of $\mathcal{W}$ into cycles, we obtain that κ is large enough for $\mathcal{W}_i$ and 1, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. That is, there is a copy $\mathcal{T}_i$ of $\mathcal{W}_i$ that is internal in $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$. Let $\delta_i = y_i - x_i$ where x_i and y_i are the lowest and highest rows reached by $\mathcal{T}_i$, respectively. Since $-n \leq \delta_i \leq n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_i = 0$, there exists a permutation π of $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $-n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} \delta_{\pi(i)} \leq n$ for every $1 \leq j \leq k$. This means that the walk $\mathcal{T}_\pi = \mathcal{T}_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{\pi(k)}$ that begins in a vertex at row $n \leq r \leq 2n$ is an internal copy of the circuit $\mathcal{W}_\pi = \mathcal{W}_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{W}_{\pi(k)}$. By definition, $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}_\pi) = 0$ and $\mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W}_\pi) = \mathrm{sep}_u(\mathcal{W})$. □

Let κ be as in Lemma 20, so $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ contains an internal copy $\mathcal{T}$ of a rolled-up circuit $\mathcal{W}$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u = \mathrm{ext} = 0$. Hence, by (3), we obtain that $\ell = d|\mathcal{T}| + d_s\sigma(\mathcal{T})$. Moreover, since every internal circuit of $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ is a copy of a circuit in $\mathcal{S}$, we obtain that

$$\ell = \max\{d|\mathcal{T}| + d_s\sigma(\mathcal{T}) \mid \mathcal{T} \text{ is an internal circuit of } \kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}\} \tag{5}$$

by Theorem 6 and Lemma 11. As discussed in [24], the value of ℓ satisfying (5) can be found in $O(\mathrm{rows}(\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S})\kappa n) = O(n^3)$ time and $O(\kappa n) = O(n^2)$ space. Then, since κ and $\kappa \cdot \mathcal{S}$ can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time and space, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 21. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a UCA model equivalent to a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, for $d \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. There is an algorithm that computes ℓ in $O(n^3)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space when $\mathcal{U}$, d and d_s are given as input.*

The second phase begins once the value of ℓ has been found. Since $d, d_s \in \mathbb{Q}$, we may write $d = \frac{a_1}{b}$ and $d_s = \frac{a_2}{b}$ for $a_1, a_2, b \in \mathbb{N}$. By (3), (4), and Lemma 20, we observe that $c = \frac{a}{b}$ for some $a \leq 4(a_1 + a_2)n^3$. Then, we can apply Theorem 7 to search for c in the range $[0, kn^3)$, for $k = 4(a_1 + a_2)n^3$. Suppose the algorithm tests whether $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to a $u = (c', \ell, d, d_s)$ at some given step. Recall that the algorithm of Theorem 7 returns either a u-CA model equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$ or a cycle $\mathcal{W}$ with $\mathrm{sep}_u > 0$. In the former case, $c \leq c'$ by definition. In the latter case, by (1), we obtain that either $c \leq c'$ (if $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}) \geq 0$) or $c \geq c'$ (if $\mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{W}) \leq 0$). This implies that only $O(\log n)$ invocations to Theorem 7 are required if we perform a binary search to locate c.

Lemma 22. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a UCA model equivalent to a (d, d_s)-minimal (c, ℓ, d, d_s)-CA model, for $d \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. There is an algorithm that computes c in $O(n^2 \log(n))$ time and $O(n)$ space when $\mathcal{M}$, d, d_s, and ℓ are given as input.*

Finally, for the last phase, we simply invoke the algorithm implied by Theorem 7 with ℓ and c as input. Since this last steps costs $O(n^2)$ time and $O(n)$ space, we obtain the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 23. *Given a UCA model $\mathcal{M}$ and two values $d \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $d_s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a (d, d_s)-minimal u-CA model can be computed in $O(n^3)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space.*

We believe the second phase (Lemma 22) can be improved to run in $O(n^2)$ time. The idea is to use "distance tuples" as in [24] when Bellman-Ford's shortest path algorithm is applied by Theorem 7. We did not follow this path because we did not find a way to improve the time complexity for the first phase (Lemma 21).

6 Further Remarks

In this article we proved that c and ℓ are integer combinations of d and d_s when $\mathcal{U}$ is a (d, d_s)-minimal model with arcs $A_1 < \ldots < A_n$. Pirlot's original definition of minimality is stronger than the one we discuss in this article, as it also requires the $\mathcal{U}$ to be *left justified* with respect to every (c', ℓ', d, d_s)-CA model equivalent $\mathcal{U}$ with arcs $A'_1 < \ldots < A'_n$, i.e., $s(A_i) \leq s(A'_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. The minimal u-CA model $\mathcal{U}$ computed by Theorem 23 is left justified, but with respect to those u-CA models [24]. It remains as an open problem to characterize when a UCA model is equivalent to a strongly UCA model.

One key ingredient of our proof is a new characterization of the family $\mathbb{M}$ of those PCA model that have equivalent UCA models. Our characterization yields a new recognition algorithm for $\mathbb{M}$ that consists of testing if any greedy nose cycle $\mathcal{W}_N$ has a vertex in common with any greedy hollow cycle $\mathcal{W}_H$. This algorithm is simpler to implement than those previously known and, even though it has the same time complexity in the worst case, it runs faster when greedy cycles are small and the synthetic graph is pre-computed (or when PCA models are implemented in a way such that we can reach the farthest arc intersecting a given arc in $O(1)$ time). This could be important in parallel or dynamic algorithms for the recognition of UCA graphs. Also, it serves to speed up the logspace recognition algorithm.

On the technical side, we apply a simple loop unrolling technique to transforms a PCA model into a PIG model that encodes it. We think that this is a promising idea to study other properties on PCA and UCA models.

References

[1] D. G. Corneil, H. Kim, S. Natarajan, S. Olariu, and A. P. Sprague. Simple linear time recognition of unit interval graphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 55(2):99–104, 1995. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(95)00046-F.

[2] V. Costa, S. Dantas, D. Sankoff, and X. Xu. Gene clusters as intersections of powers of paths. *J. Braz. Comput. Soc.*, 18(2):129–136, 2012. doi:10.1007/s13173-012-0064-8.

[3] J. Czyzowicz, E. Kranakis, D. Krizanc, and J. Urrutia. Discrete realizations of contact and intersection graphs. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 13(4):429–442, 2004.

[4] G. Durán, A. Gravano, R. M. McConnell, J. Spinrad, and A. Tucker. Polynomial time recognition of unit circular-arc graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 58(1):67–78, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.jalgor.2004.08.003.

[5] G. Durán, F. Fernández Slezak, L. N. Grippo, F. de Souza Oliveira, and J. L. Szwarcfiter. On unit interval graphs with integer endpoints. In *LAGOS'15—{VIII} Latin-American Algorithms, Graphs and Optimization Symposium*, vol. 50 of *Electron. Notes Discrete Math.*, pp. 445–450. Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.endm.2015.07.074.

[6] G. Even and S. Shahar. Scheduling of a smart antenna: Capacitated coloring of unit circular-arc graphs. In *Combinatorial and Algorithmic Aspects of Networking*, vol. 4235 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pp. 58–71. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. doi:10.1007/11922377_6.

[7] N. J. Fine and R. Harrop. Uniformization of linear arrays. *J. Symb. Logic*, 22:130–140, 1957. doi:10.2307/2964174.

[8] F. Foulks. On the concept of the scale. *J. Philos. Logic*, 28(3):235–264, 1999. doi:10.1023/A:1004345812550.

[9] I. Fox. Distance from indifference. *Erkenntnis*, 12(2):249–279, 1978. doi:10.1007/BF00172229.

[10] P. Fraigniaud and C. Gavoille. Interval routing schemes. *Algorithmica*, 21(2):155–182, 1998. doi:10.1007/PL00009211.

[11] E. H. Galanter. An axiomatic and experimental study of sensory order and measure. *Psychol. Rev.*, 63(1):16–28, 1956.

[12] N. Goodman. Topology of quality. In *The Structure of Appearance*, vol. 53 of *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, pp. 215–257. Springer Netherlands, 1977. doi:10.1007/978-94-010-1184-6_10.

[13] H. Kaplan and Y. Nussbaum. Certifying algorithms for recognizing proper circular-arc graphs and unit circular-arc graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 157(15):3216–3230, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2009.07.002.

[14] P. Klavík, J. Kratochvíl, Y. Otachi, I. Rutter, T. Saitoh, M. Saumell, and T. Vyskočil. Extending partial representations of proper and unit interval graphs. *Algorithmica*, pp. 1–34, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00453-016-0133-z.

[15] J. Köbler, S. Kuhnert, and O. Verbitsky. Solving the canonical representation and star system problems for proper circular-arc graphs in logspace. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jda.2016.03.001.

[16] M. C. Lin and J. L. Szwarcfiter. Unit circular-arc graph representations and feasible circulations. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 22(1):409–423, 2008. doi:10.1137/060650805.

[17] M. C. Lin, F. J. Soulignac, and J. L. Szwarcfiter. Short models for unit interval graphs. In *LAGOS'09—V Latin-American Algorithms, Graphs and Optimization Symposium*, vol. 35 of *Electron. Notes Discrete Math.*, pp. 247–255. Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.endm.2009.11.041.

[18] R. D. Luce. Semiorders and a theory of utility discrimination. *Econometrica*, 24:178–191, 1956. doi:10.2307/1905751.

[19] J. Mitas. Minimal representation of semiorders with intervals of same length. In *Orders, algorithms, and applications (Lyon, 1994)*, vol. 831 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pp. 162–175. Springer, Berlin, 1994. doi:10.1007/BFb0019433.

[20] M. Pirlot. Minimal representation of a semiorder. *Theory and Decision*, 28(2):109–141, 1990. doi:10.1007/BF00160932.

[21] M. Pirlot and P. Vincke. *Semiorders*, vol. 36 of *Theory and Decision Library. Series B: Mathematical and Statistical Methods*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1997. doi:10.1007/978-94-015-8883-6.

[22] F. S. Roberts. Indifference graphs. In *Proof Techniques in Graph Theory (Proc. Second Ann Arbor Graph Theory Conf., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1968)*, pp. 139–146. Academic Press, New York, 1969.

[23] D. Scott and P. Suppes. Foundational aspects of theories of measurement. *J. Symb. Logic*, 23:113–128, 1958. doi:10.2307/2964389.

[24] F. J. Soulignac. Bounded, minimal, and short representations of unit interval and unit circular-arc graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1408.3443, 2014.

[25] A. Tucker. Structure theorems for some circular-arc graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 7:167–195, 1974. doi:10.1016/S0012-365X(74)80027-0.